

THE ε - REVISED SYSTEM OF THE RIGID BODY WITH THREE LINEAR CONTROLS

Dan COMĂNESCU, Mihai IVAN and Gheorghe IVAN

Abstract. In this paper we introduce the ε - revised system associated to a Hamilton - Poisson system. The ε - revised system of the rigid body with three linear controls is defined and some of its geometrical and dynamical properties are investigated. ¹

1 Introduction

It is well known that many dynamical systems can be formulated using a Poisson structure (see for instance, R. Abraham and J. E. Marsden [1] and M. Puta [11]).

The metriplectic systems was introduced by P. J. Morrison in the paper [8]. These systems combine both the conservative and dissipative systems.

A metriplectic system is a differential system of the form $\dot{x} = PdH + gdC$, where P is a Poisson tensor on a manifold M , g is a symmetric tensor of type $(2,0)$ on M , and H and C are two smooth functions on M with the additional requirements:

(a) $PdC = 0$; (b) $gdH = 0$ and (c) $dC \cdot gdC \leq 0$.

The differential systems of the form $\dot{x} = PdH + gdC$ which satisfies only the conditions (a) and (b) are called almost metriplectic systems (see Fish, [2]; Marsden, [7]; Ortega and Planas - Bielsa, [9]). An interesting class of almost metriplectic systems are so-called the revised dynamical systems associated to Hamilton-Poisson systems (see Gh. Ivan and D. Oprea, [5]).

The control of the rotation rigid body is one of the problems with a large practical applicability. For this reason, in this paper we study the ε - revised dynamical system associated to the rigid body with three linear controls.

2 Almost metriplectic systems

We start this section with the presentation of the concept of almost metriplectic manifold (see Ortega and Planas- Bielsa, [9]).

Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and let $C^\infty(M)$ be the ring of smooth real-valued functions on M .

A *Leibniz manifold* is a pair $(M, [\cdot, \cdot])$, where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is a Leibniz bracket on M , that is $[\cdot, \cdot] : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ is a $\mathbf{R}$ - bilinear operation satisfying the following two conditions:

(i) the *left Leibniz rule*:

$$[f_1 \cdot f_2, f_3] = [f_1, f_3] \cdot f_2 + f_1 \cdot [f_2, f_3] \quad \text{for all } f_1, f_2, f_3 \in C^\infty(M);$$

¹2000 Mathematical Subject Classification : 58F05.

Key words and phrases: almost metriplectic system, ε - revised system, rigid body

(ii) the *right Leibniz rule*:

$$[f_1, f_2 \cdot f_3] = [f_1, f_2] \cdot f_3 + f_2 \cdot [f_1, f_3] \quad \text{for all } f_1, f_2, f_3 \in C^\infty(M)$$

where “ $\cdot$ ” denotes the ordinary multiplication of functions.

Let P and $\mathbf{g}$ be two tensor fields of type $(2, 0)$ on M and $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$ be a parameter.

We define the map $[\cdot, (\cdot, \cdot)]_\varepsilon : C^\infty(M) \times (C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M)) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ by:

$$[f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = P(df, dh_1) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_2), \quad \text{for all } f, h_1, h_2 \in C^\infty(M). \quad (1)$$

Proposition 2.1. *The map $[\cdot, (\cdot, \cdot)]_\varepsilon$ given by (1) satisfy the following relations:*

- (i) $[af_1 + bf_2, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = a[f_1, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon + b[f_2, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon$;
- (ii) $[f, a(h_1, h_2) + b(h'_1, h'_2)]_\varepsilon = a[f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon + b[f, (h'_1, h'_2)]_\varepsilon$;
- (iii) $[ff_1, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = f[f_1, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon + f_1[f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon$;
- (iv) $[f, h(h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = h[f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon + h_1 P(df, dh) + \varepsilon h_2 \mathbf{g}(df, dh)$,

for all $f, f_1, f_2, h_1, h_2, h'_1, h'_2 \in C^\infty(M)$ and $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$.

Proof. Applying the properties of the differential of functions and using that P and $\mathbf{g}$ are $\mathbf{R}$ -bilinear maps, it is easy to establish the relations (i) – (iv). $\square$

We consider the map $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ defined by:

$$[[f, h]]_\varepsilon = [f, (h, h)]_\varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } f, h \in C^\infty(M). \quad (2)$$

Therefore, the map $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon : C^\infty(M) \times C^\infty(M) \rightarrow C^\infty(M)$ is given by:

$$[[f, h]]_\varepsilon = P(df, dh) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh), \quad \text{for all } f, h \in C^\infty(M). \quad (3)$$

Proposition 2.2. *The bracket $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon$ on M given by (3) verify the right Leibniz rule:*

$$[[f, hh']]_\varepsilon = h[[f, h']]_\varepsilon + h'[[f, h]]_\varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } f, h, h' \in C^\infty(M).$$

Proof. Indeed, $[[f, hh']]_\varepsilon = [f, (hh', hh')]_\varepsilon = [f, h(h', h')]_\varepsilon$. Putting $h_1 = h_2 = h'$ in the relation (iv) from Proposition 2.1, we have successive:

$$\begin{aligned} [f, h(h', h')]_\varepsilon &= h[f, (h', h')] + h' P(df, dh) + \varepsilon h' \mathbf{g}(df, dh) = h[f, (h', h')]_\varepsilon + h'(P(df, dh) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh)) \\ &= h[f, (h', h')]_\varepsilon + h'[f, (h, h)]_\varepsilon = h[[f, h']]_\varepsilon + h'[[f, h]]_\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

By Proposition 2.1. (i), (ii) and (iii) and Proposition 2.2, we have that the map $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon$ given by (3) is a Leibniz bracket on M . Hence, $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon$ defines a Leibniz structure on the manifold M and $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ is a Leibniz manifold for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$.

A Leibniz manifold $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ such that P is a skewsymmetric tensor field and $\mathbf{g}$ is a symmetric tensor field is called *almost metriplectic manifold*. In other words, given a skewsymmetric tensor field P of type $(2, 0)$ and a symmetric tensor field $\mathbf{g}$ of type $(2, 0)$ on a manifold M , we can define an almost metriplectic structure on M .

If the tensor field P is Poisson and the tensor field $\mathbf{g}$ is nondegenerate, then $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ is a *metriplectic manifold*, see Ortega & Planas - Bielsa [9].

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ be an almost metriplectic manifold. If there exist $h_1, h_2 \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $P(df, dh_2) = 0$ and $\mathbf{g}(df, dh_1) = 0$ for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$, then the bracket $[[\cdot, \cdot]]$ given by (3) satisfies the relation:*

$$[[f, h_1 + h_2]]_\varepsilon = [f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } f \in C^\infty(M). \quad (4)$$

Proof. Indeed, $[[f, h_1 + h_2]]_\varepsilon = P(df, d(h_1 + h_2)) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, d(h_1 + h_2)) = P(df, dh_1 + dh_2) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_1 + dh_2) = P(df, dh_1) + P(df, dh_2) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_1) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_2) = P(df, dh_1) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_2) = [f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon. \quad \square$

Let $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ be an almost metriplectic manifold and let $h_1, h_2 \in C^\infty(M)$ two functions such that $P(df, dh_2) = 0$ and $\mathbf{g}(df, dh_1) = 0$ for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$. The vector field $X_{h_1 h_2}$ given by:

$$X_{h_1 h_2}(f) = [[f, h_1 + h_2]]_\varepsilon \quad \text{for any } f \in C^\infty(M)$$

is called the *Leibniz vector field* associated to the triple (h_1, h_2, ε) on M .

Taking account into Proposition 2.3 and (1), $X_{h_1 h_2}$ is given by:

$$X_{h_1 h_2}(f) = [f, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = P(df, dh_1) + \varepsilon \mathbf{g}(df, dh_2), \quad \text{for all } f \in C^\infty(M). \quad (5)$$

In local coordinates on M , the differential system given by:

$$\dot{x}^i = [[x^i, h_1 + h_2]]_\varepsilon = [x^i, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon \quad (6)$$

where

$$[x^i, (h_1, h_2)]_\varepsilon = X_{h_1 h_2}(x^i) = P^{ij} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j} + \varepsilon g^{ij} \frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x^j}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n} \quad (7)$$

with $P^{ij} = P(dx^i, dx^j)$ and $g^{ij} = \mathbf{g}(dx^i, dx^j)$, is called the *almost metriplectic system* on M associated to the Leibniz vector field $X_{h_1 h_2}$ with the bracket $[[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon$.

We denote the matrix of the tensor fields P and $\mathbf{g}$ respectively by $P = (P^{ij})$ and $g = (g^{ij})$. We have that P is a skewsymmetric matrix and g is a symmetric matrix.

We give now a way for to produce almost metriplectic manifolds.

Proposition 2.4. *For a skewsymmetric tensor P of type $(2, 0)$ on a manifold M and two functions $h_1, h_2 \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $P(df, dh_2) = 0$ for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$, there exists a symmetric tensor $\mathbf{g}$ of type $(2, 0)$ on M such that $\mathbf{g}(df, dh_1) = 0$ for all $f \in C^\infty(M)$ and $(M, P, \mathbf{g}, [[\cdot, \cdot]]_\varepsilon)$ is an almost metriplectic manifold.*

Proof. In a system of local coordinates on M , let $g = (g^{ij})$ the matrix of the symmetric tensor $\mathbf{g}$ which must to be determined. Then, the components g^{ij} , $i, j = \overline{1, n}$ verify the system of differential equations $g^{ij} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j} = 0$, $i, j = \overline{1, n}$.

In a chart U such that $\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j}(x) \neq 0$, the components g^{ij} are given by:

$$\begin{cases} g^{ii}(x) &= - \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^n \left(\frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^k} \right)^2 \\ g^{ij}(x) &= \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^i} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j}, \quad \text{for } i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Applying now Proposition 2.3 we obtain the result. $\square$

Proposition 2.4 is useful when we consider the ε - revised system of a Hamilton-Poisson system.

For this, let be a Hamilton-Poisson system on M described by the Poisson tensor P having the matrix $P = (P^{ij})$ and by the Hamiltonian function $h_1 \in C^\infty(M)$ with the Casimir function $h_2 \in C^\infty(M)$ (i.e. $P^{ij} \frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x^j} = 0$ for $i, j = \overline{1, n}$). The differential equations of the Hamilton-Poisson system are the following:

$$\dot{x}^i = P^{ij} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}. \quad (9)$$

Using (8), we determine the matrix $g = (g^{ij})$ and we have:

$$g^{ij} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j} = 0, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}. \quad (10)$$

Applying now Proposition 2.4, for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, we obtain an almost metriplectic structure on M associated to system (9). The differential system associated to this structure is called the ε - *revised system* of the Hamilton - Poisson system.

Hence, the ε - revised system of the Hamilton - Poisson system defined by (9) is:

$$\dot{x}^i = P^{ij} \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^j} + \varepsilon g^{ij} \frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x^j}, \quad i, j = \overline{1, n}. \quad (11)$$

The terms $g^{ij} \frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x^j}$, $i, j = \overline{1, n}$ from the ε - revised system (11) describe a *cube perturbation* of the Hamilton - Poisson system.

Remark 2.1. We observe that the 0- revised system (11) coincide with the Hamilton - Poisson system (9). $\square$

3 The ε - revised system associated to the rigid body with three linear controls

The rigid body equations with three linear controls (see, M. Puta and D. Comănescu [12]) are given by:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}^1 &= (a_3 - a_2)x^2x^3 + cx^2 - bx^3 \\ \dot{x}^2 &= (a_1 - a_3)x^1x^3 - cx^1 + ax^3 \\ \dot{x}^3 &= (a_2 - a_1)x^1x^2 + bx^1 - ax^2 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $x(t) = (x^1(t), x^2(t), x^3(t)) \in \mathbf{R}^3$ and $a_1 = \frac{1}{I_1}$, $a_2 = \frac{1}{I_2}$, $a_3 = \frac{1}{I_3}$ with $I_1 > I_2 > I_3 > 0$ (I_1, I_2, I_3 being the principal moments of inertia of the body) and $a, b, c \in \mathbf{R}$ are feedback parameters. We have $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3$.

The dynamics (12) is described by the Poisson tensor Π and by the Hamiltonian H on $\mathbf{R}^3$ given by:

$$\Pi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -x^3 & x^2 \\ x^3 & 0 & -x^1 \\ -x^2 & x^1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{2}[a_1(x^1)^2 + a_2(x^2)^2 + a_3(x^3)^2] + ax^1 + bx^2 + cx^3. \quad (14)$$

Using (13) and (14), the dynamics (12) can be written in the matrix form:

$$\dot{x}(t) = \Pi(x(t)) \cdot \nabla H(x(t)), \quad (15)$$

where $\dot{x}(t) = (\dot{x}^1(t), \dot{x}^2(t), \dot{x}^3(t))^T$ and $\nabla H(x(t))$ is the gradient of the Hamiltonian function H with respect to the canonical metric on $\mathbf{R}^3$.

Therefore, the dynamics (12) has the Hamilton-Poisson formulation $(\mathbf{R}^3, \Pi, H)$, where Π and H are given by (13) and (14).

The function $C \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}^3)$ given by:

$$C(x) = \frac{1}{2}[(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 + (x^3)^2] \quad (16)$$

is a Casimir of the configuration $(\mathbf{R}^3, \Pi)$, i.e.

$$C(x) \cdot \nabla H(x) = 0. \quad (17)$$

Applying the relations (8) for $P = \Pi$, $h_1(x) = H(x)$ and $h_2(x) = C(x)$, the symmetric tensor $\mathbf{g}$ is given by the matrix:

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} -(a_2x^2 + b)^2 - (a_3x^3 + c)^2 & (a_1x^1 + a)(a_2x^2 + b) & (a_1x^1 + a)(a_3x^3 + c) \\ (a_1x^1 + a)(a_2x^2 + b) & -(a_1x^1 + a)^2 - (a_3x^3 + c)^2 & (a_2x^2 + b)(a_3x^3 + c) \\ (a_1x^1 + a)(a_3x^3 + c) & (a_2x^2 + b)(a_3x^3 + c) & -(a_1x^1 + a)^2 - (a_2x^2 + b)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{since } \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^1} = a_1 x^1 + a, \quad \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^2} = a_2 x^2 + b, \quad \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x^3} = a_3 x^3 + c.$$

We have

$$g(x) \cdot \nabla h_2(x) = (v_1(x), v_2(x), v_3(x))^T \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} v_1(x) = -[(a_2 x^2 + b)^2 + (a_3 x^3 + c)^2]x^1 + (a_1 x^1 + a)[(a_2 x^2 + b)x^2 + (a_3 x^3 + c)x^3] \\ v_2(x) = -[(a_1 x^1 + a)^2 + (a_3 x^3 + c)^2]x^2 + (a_2 x^2 + b)[(a_1 x^1 + a)x^1 + (a_3 x^3 + c)x^3] \\ v_3(x) = -[(a_1 x^1 + a)^2 + (a_2 x^2 + b)^2]x^3 + (a_3 x^3 + c)[(a_1 x^1 + a)x^1 + (a_2 x^2 + b)x^2] \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

The ε - revised system associated to dynamics (12) is:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}^1 = [(a_3 - a_2)x^2 x^3 + cx^2 - bx^3] + \varepsilon v_1(x) \\ \dot{x}^2 = [(a_1 - a_3)x^1 x^3 - cx^1 + ax^3] + \varepsilon v_2(x) \\ \dot{x}^3 = [(a_2 - a_1)x^1 x^2 + bx^1 - ax^2] + \varepsilon v_3(x) \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

The differential system (20) is called the ε - *revised system* of the rigid body with three linear controls. Taking $a = b = c = 0$ and $\varepsilon = 1$ in (20), we obtain the revised system of the free rigid body, see [5].

Vector writing of the ε - revised system (20). We introduce the following notations:

$$\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3), \quad \mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3), \quad \mathbf{a} = (a, b, c), \quad \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) = (a_1 x^1 + a, a_2 x^2 + b, a_3 x^3 + c).$$

For all $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3), \mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbf{R}^3$, the following relation holds:

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot [\mathbf{w} \times (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w})] = (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w})^2, \quad \text{with} \quad (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w})^2 = (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w}) \cdot (\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w}) \quad (21)$$

where " $\times$ " and " $\cdot$ " denote the cross product resp. inner product in $\mathbf{R}^3$; that is:

$$\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{w} = (u_2 w_3 - u_3 w_2, u_3 w_1 - u_1 w_3, u_1 w_2 - u_2 w_1), \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{w} = u_1 w_1 + u_2 w_2 + u_3 w_3.$$

With the above notations, the dynamics (12) has the vector form:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (22)$$

It is not hard to verify the following equality:

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (23)$$

Using the relations (22), (23) and (20), we can written the ε - revised system (20) in the vector form:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon[(\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})]. \quad (24)$$

4 The equilibrium points of the ε - revised system

The equilibrium points of the Hamilton - Poisson system (12) (or (22)) are solutions of the vector equation:

$$\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (25)$$

The equilibrium points of the ε - revised system (20) (or (24)) are solutions of the vector equation:

$$\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon[(\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})] = \mathbf{0}. \quad (26)$$

Theorem 4.1. *The Hamilton - Poisson system (12) and its revised system (20) have the same equilibrium points.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x}_0$ be an equilibrium point of the system (12). According with (25) follows $\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$. We have that $\mathbf{x}_0$ is a solution of the vector equation (26), since $\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) + (\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0)) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0} + \mathbf{0} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$. Hence $\mathbf{x}_0$ is an equilibrium point of the ε - revised system (20).

Conversely, let $\mathbf{x}_0$ be an equilibrium point for (20). Using (25) it follows

$$(a) \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) + \varepsilon[\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0)) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0)] = \mathbf{0}$$

The relation (a) can be written in the form:

$$(b) \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \varepsilon[\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) \times (\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0))] = \mathbf{0}$$

Multiplying the relation (b) with the vector $\mathbf{x}_0$, we obtain:

$$(c) \quad \mathbf{x}_0 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0)) - \varepsilon \mathbf{x}_0 \cdot [\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) \times (\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0))] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Using the equality (21), the relation (c) is equivalent with:

$$(d) \quad -\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0))^2 = \mathbf{0}.$$

From (d) (if $\varepsilon \neq 0$), follows $\mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{0}$, that is $\mathbf{x}_0$ is an equilibrium point for (20).

□

The equilibrium points of the dynamics (12) are well-known (see M. Puta and D. Comănescu, [12]) and these are presented in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. ([12]) *The equilibrium points of the Hamilton - Poisson system (12) are the following:*

$$(i) \quad e_1 = (0, 0, 0);$$

$$(ii) \quad e_2 = \left(\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1}, \frac{b}{\lambda - a_2}, \frac{c}{\lambda - a_3} \right) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{a_1, a_2, a_3\};$$

$$(iii) \quad e_3 = \left(\alpha, -\frac{b}{a_2 - a_1}, \frac{c}{a_1 - a_3} \right) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \text{if } a = 0;$$

$$(iv) \quad e_4 = \left(\frac{a}{a_2 - a_1}, \alpha, -\frac{c}{a_3 - a_2} \right) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \text{if } b = 0;$$

$$(v) \quad e_5 = \left(-\frac{a}{a_1 - a_2}, \frac{b}{a_3 - a_2}, \alpha \right) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \text{if } c = 0.$$

By Theorem 4.1, the equilibrium points of the ε - revised system (20) are $e_1, \dots, e_5$ indicated in the Proposition 4.1.

It is well-known that the dynamics (12) have the first integrals H and C given by (14) and (16). These first integrals may be written thus:

$$H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{I}^{-1} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} \quad \text{and} \quad C(x^1, x^2, x^3) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^2 \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ is inertia tensor and $\mathbf{I}^{-1}$ is its inverse. We have:

$$\frac{dH}{dt}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dC}{dt}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (28)$$

Indeed, $\frac{dH}{dt} = (a_1 x^1 + a) \dot{x}^1 + (a_2 x^2 + b) \dot{x}^2 + (a_3 x^3 + c) \dot{x}^3 = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}}$ and

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = x^1 \dot{x}^1 + x^2 \dot{x}^2 + x^3 \dot{x}^3 = \mathbf{x} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}}.$$

Theorem 4.2. (i) For each $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}$, the function H given by (14) is a first integral for the ε - revised system (20).

(ii) If $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ is a solution of the ε - revised system, then:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^2 \right) = -\varepsilon (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}))^2. \quad (29)$$

(iii) For $\varepsilon \in \mathbf{R}^*$, the function C is not a first integral for the ε - revised system.

Proof. (i) Multiplying the relation (24) with the vector $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})$, we have:

$\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) + \varepsilon \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot [(\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})] = \mathbf{0}$. Applying now (28),

we obtain $\frac{dH}{dt} = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence H is a first integral for the system (20).

(ii) Multiplying the relation (24) with the vector $\mathbf{x}$, we have

$\mathbf{x} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x} \cdot (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) + \varepsilon \mathbf{x} \cdot [(\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})) \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x})] = -\varepsilon \mathbf{x} \cdot [\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}) \times (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}))]$.

Using now the equality (21), we obtain $\mathbf{x} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\varepsilon (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}))^2$. Then, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^2 \right) = \mathbf{x} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = -\varepsilon (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}))^2.$$

(iii) This assertion follows from the second relation of (28) and (ii). $\square$

Remark 4.1. The function H given by (14) can be put in the equivalent form:

$$H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = \frac{1}{2} \left[a_1 \left(x^1 + \frac{a}{a_1} \right)^2 + a_2 \left(x^2 + \frac{b}{a_2} \right)^2 + a_3 \left(x^3 + \frac{c}{a_3} \right)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{a^2}{a_1} + \frac{b^2}{a_2} + \frac{c^2}{a_3} \right). \quad (30)$$

For a given constant $k \in \mathbf{R}$, the geometrical image of the surface:

$$H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = k$$

is an ellipsoid, since $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0, a_3 > 0$. $\square$

Proposition 4.2. *The set of equilibrium points which belong to the ellipsoid $H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = k$, is finite.*

Proof. Following the description of the equilibrium points given in Proposition 4.1, we remark that:

(i) the equilibrium points of the form e_3 (similarly, for e_4 and e_5) make a straight line; the intersection between a straight line and an ellipsoid have at most two points; we deduce that on the chosen ellipsoid there exist at most two points of the form e_3 .

(ii) the equilibrium points of the form e_2 can be obtained by solving with respect λ the following equation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left[a_1 \left(\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1} \right)^2 + a_2 \left(\frac{b}{\lambda - a_2} \right)^2 + a_3 \left(\frac{c}{\lambda - a_3} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{a^2}{\lambda - a_1} + \frac{b^2}{\lambda - a_2} + \frac{c^2}{\lambda - a_3} = k.$$

The above equation is equivalent with the determination of roots of a polynomial of degree at most 6; therefore on the chosen ellipsoid there exist at most 6 equilibrium points of the form e_2 . $\square$

5 The behaviour of the solutions of the ε - revised system

Theorem 5.1 (i) The solutions of the ε -revised system are bounded.

(ii) The maximal solutions of the ε -revised system are globally solutions (i.e. these are defined on $\mathbf{R}$).

Proof (i) Given a solution of (20), there exists a constant k such that its trajectory lie on the ellipsoid $H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = k$. From this we deduce that all solutions are bounded.

(ii) Let $\mathbf{x} : (m, M) \subset \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ be a maximal solution. We assume that $\mathbf{x}$ is not globally. It follows $m > -\infty$ or $M < \infty$. In these situations, we known that there exists $k \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = k$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$ and the graph of the solution is contained in a compact domain. According with [6] (theorem 3.2.5, p.141) we obtain a contradiction with the fact that $\mathbf{x}$ admit a prolongation on the right or the left (also, can be applied the theorem of Chilingworth (1976), see theorem 1.0.3, p.7 in [3]). $\square$

In the sequel we study the asymptotic behaviour of the globally solutions of the ε -revised system.

Denote by $\mathbf{E}$ the set of equilibrium points of the ε -revised system (20) and by Γ the trajectory of a solution $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ of (20). By theory of differential equations (see [10] p. 174-176), the ω -limit set and α -limit set of Γ are:

$$\omega(\Gamma) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{R}^3 / \exists t_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ such that } \mathbf{x}(t_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{y}\},$$

$$\alpha(\Gamma) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^3 / \exists t_n \rightarrow -\infty \text{ such that } \mathbf{x}(t_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}\}.$$

Theorem 5.2 Let $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ be a solution of the ε -revised system with $\varepsilon \neq 0$. There exist the equilibrium points $\mathbf{x}_m, \mathbf{x}_M \in \mathbf{R}^3$ of the system (20) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_M$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}_m$.

Proof The theorem is proved in the following steps:

- (i) $\alpha(\Gamma) \neq \emptyset$ and $\omega(\Gamma) \neq \emptyset$.
- (ii) $\alpha(\Gamma) \cap \omega(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{E}$.
- (iii) The sets $\alpha(\Gamma)$ and $\omega(\Gamma)$ contains exactly one element.

Taking account into that each solution is bounded (hence it is contained in a compact domain) and applying theorem 1, p. 175 in [10], we obtain immediately the assertions (i).

(ii) For demonstration consider the case when $\varepsilon > 0$. Using the relation (29), we deduce that the function $t \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^2(t)$ is a strictly decreasing function. Being bounded it follows that there exists $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}^2(t) = L$ and L is finite.

For each $\mathbf{y} \in \omega(\Gamma)$ there exists the sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\mathbf{x}(t_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{y}$. Then $\mathbf{x}^2(t_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{y}^2$ and hence $\mathbf{y}^2 = L$.

By theorem 2, p.176 in [10], we have that the trajectory $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}}$ of the solution $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}}$ which verifies the initial condition $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}}(0) = \mathbf{y}$, satisfies the relation $\Gamma_{\mathbf{y}} \subset \omega(\Gamma)$.

If we assume that $\mathbf{y}$ is not an equilibrium point, then we deduce (using the relation (29)) that for $t > 0$ we have $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{y}}^2(t) < L$ and this is in contradiction with the above result. Therefore, we have $\omega(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{E}$.

Similarly, we prove that $\alpha(\Gamma) \subset \mathbf{E}$. Hence the assertion (ii) holds.

The case $\varepsilon < 0$ is similar.

(iii) There exists a constant k such that the sets $\alpha(\Gamma)$ and $\omega(\Gamma)$ are included in the ellipsoid $H(x^1, x^2, x^3) = k$. By (ii), we deduce that $\alpha(\Gamma)$ and $\omega(\Gamma)$ are included in the set of equilibrium points which lies of the above ellipsoid. On the other hand, applying Proposition 4.2 and using the fact that $\alpha(\Gamma)$ and $\omega(\Gamma)$ are connected (see theorem 1, p.175 in [10]), we obtain that $\alpha(\Gamma)$ and $\omega(\Gamma)$ are formed by only one element. $\square$

Remark 5.1 Using the relation (29) it is easy to observe that the following assertions hold:

- (i) if $\varepsilon > 0$ then $\mathbf{x}_M^2 > \mathbf{x}_m^2$;
- (ii) if $\varepsilon < 0$ then $\mathbf{x}_M^2 < \mathbf{x}_m^2$.

$\square$

As an immediate consequence we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.3 If $\varepsilon \neq 0$, then for each solution $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ of the ε -revised system we have:

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } t \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow d(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{E}) \rightarrow 0 \\ \text{if } t \rightarrow -\infty \Rightarrow d(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{E}) \rightarrow 0. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

□

Remark 5.2 From Theorem 5.3 follows that the set $\mathbf{E}$ of the equilibrium points is an attracting set (see definition 2, p.178 in [10]) and also is a repelling set (see [3], p.34). Thus, the space $\mathbf{R}^3$ is simultaneously a domain of attraction and a domain of repulsion of $\mathbf{E}$. □

6 The Lyapunov stability of equilibrium points of the ε - revised system in the case $\varepsilon > 0$

The stability of the point $e_1 = (0, 0, 0)$. We have the following results.

Theorem 6.1 The equilibrium point e_1 is Lyapunov stable.

Proof Let $\gamma > 0$, $t_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{R}^3$ such that $|\mathbf{x}_0| < \gamma$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the euclidian norm in $\mathbf{R}^3$. Denote by $t \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)$ the solution of the ε -revised system which verifies the initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$.

Using the relation $|\mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)| = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^2(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)}$ and according with the relation (29), we observe that the function $t \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)$ is a decreasing function and hence we have:

$$|\mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)| \leq |\mathbf{x}_0| < \gamma \text{ for } t > t_0.$$

Then (see [4], p.22) we have that e_1 is a Lyapunov stable equilibrium point. □

Remark 6.1 The equilibrium point e_1 is not asymptotical stable.

Indeed, if $a = b = c = 0$ then the coordinates axis are formed from equilibrium points. If at least of one of the numbers a, b, c is non null, then:

$$\text{if } |\lambda| \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow \left(\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1}, \frac{b}{\lambda - a_2}, \frac{c}{\lambda - a_3} \right) \rightarrow (0, 0, 0).$$

Hence, in all neighbourhood of e_1 there exist an infinity of equilibrium points. □

The stability of the point $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \left(-\frac{a}{a_1}, -\frac{b}{a_2}, -\frac{c}{a_3} \right)$. The equilibrium point $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_0$ is an equilibrium point of the form e_2 and it is obtained for $\lambda = 0$.

Theorem 6.2 The equilibrium point $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_0$ is Lyapunov stable.

Proof Using the relation (30) and the inequality $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, we deduce:

$$\frac{a_1}{2}|\mathbf{x} - \overline{\mathbf{x}_0}| \leq H(\mathbf{x}) - H(\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}) \leq \frac{a_3}{2}|\mathbf{x} - \overline{\mathbf{x}_0}|$$

For $t_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{R}^3$ denote with $\mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)$ a solution of ε -revised system which verifies the initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$.

Let $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta(\gamma) = \frac{2\gamma}{a_1}$. Let $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{R}^3$ such that:

$$H(\mathbf{x}_0) - H(\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}) \leq \delta(\gamma).$$

From the fact that H is a first integral we deduce that:

$$H(\mathbf{x}(t, t_0, \mathbf{x}_0)) - H(\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}) = H(\mathbf{x}_0) - H(\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}).$$

Hence for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$ the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{a_1}{2}|\mathbf{x} - \overline{\mathbf{x}_0}| \leq \delta(\gamma)$$

and we obtain that $\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}$ is Lyapunov stable. $\square$

Remark 6.2 The stable equilibrium point $\overline{\mathbf{x}_0}$ realizes the absolute minimum of the function H . $\square$

The unstability of equilibrium points of the form e_2 with $\lambda \in (0, a_1)$. For the demonstration of this results we use the Theorem 6.3 and Lemma 6.1.

Theorem 6.3 If $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{E}$ such that there exists $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{E}$ with the properties:

$$(i) H(\mathbf{y}) = H(\mathbf{x}_0) \text{ and } (ii) |\mathbf{y}| < |\mathbf{x}_0|$$

then $\mathbf{x}_0$ is an unstable equilibrium point.

Proof For $k \in \mathbf{R}$ denote by $\mathbf{E}_k = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{E} / H(\mathbf{x}) = k\}$. The set $\mathbf{E}_{H(\mathbf{x}_0)}$ is finite (by Proposition 4.2). We denote:

$$\gamma_0 = \min\{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0| / \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{E}_{H(\mathbf{x}_0)} - \{\mathbf{x}_0\}\}$$

Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{R}^3$ such that $H(\mathbf{z}) = H(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and $|\mathbf{z}| < |\mathbf{x}_0|$. Then:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{x}(t, 0, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbf{E}$$

and

$$\text{if } t > 0 \Rightarrow |\mathbf{x}(t, 0, \mathbf{z})| < |\mathbf{z}|$$

and we deduce that there exists $t_z > 0$ such that:

$$|\mathbf{x}(t, 0, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{x}_0| > \frac{\gamma_0}{2} \text{ if } t > t_z$$

It follows that $\mathbf{x}_0$ is unstable. □

We assume that $(a, b, c) \neq (0, 0, 0)$ and we introduce the notation:

$$e_{2\lambda} = \left(\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1}, \frac{b}{\lambda - a_2}, \frac{c}{\lambda - a_3} \right) \text{ for all } \lambda \in \mathbf{R} - \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$$

- Lemma 6.1** (i) If $\sigma < \mu < a_1$, then $|e_{2\sigma}| < |e_{2\mu}|$.
(ii) If $\sigma, \mu > 0$, $(\frac{\mu}{\sigma})^2 > \frac{a_3}{a_1}$ and $H(e_{2\sigma}) = H(e_{2\mu})$, then $|e_{2\sigma}| > |e_{2\mu}|$.
(iii) If $0 < \sigma < a_1 < a_3 < \mu$ and $H(e_{2\sigma}) = H(e_{2\mu})$, then $|e_{2\sigma}| > |e_{2\mu}|$.

Proof (i) Consider the function $g : (-\infty, a_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by:

$$g(\lambda) = \left(\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{b}{\lambda - a_2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{c}{\lambda - a_3} \right)^2.$$

The derivative of the function g is:

$$g'(\lambda) = -\frac{2a^2}{(\lambda - a_1)^3} - \frac{2b^2}{(\lambda - a_2)^3} - \frac{2c^2}{(\lambda - a_3)^3}$$

We observe that $g'(\lambda) > 0$ and we obtain that g is a strictly increasing function. We have:

$$g(\sigma) = |e_{2\sigma}|^2, \quad g(\mu) = |e_{2\mu}|^2$$

and we obtain the desired result.

(ii) From hypothesis $H(e_{2\sigma}) = H(e_{2\mu})$ follows that there exists a constant $q > 0$ with the following properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{a_1} \frac{a^2}{(\sigma - a_1)^2} + \frac{1}{a_2} \frac{b^2}{(\sigma - a_2)^2} + \frac{1}{a_3} \frac{c^2}{(\sigma - a_3)^2} &= \frac{q}{\sigma^2} \\ \frac{1}{a_1} \frac{a^2}{(\mu - a_1)^2} + \frac{1}{a_2} \frac{b^2}{(\mu - a_2)^2} + \frac{1}{a_3} \frac{c^2}{(\mu - a_3)^2} &= \frac{q}{\mu^2} \end{aligned}$$

Using $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, we obtain the inequalities:

$$|e_{2\sigma}|^2 > \frac{a_1 q}{\sigma}, \quad |e_{2\mu}|^2 < \frac{a_3 q}{\mu}$$

and we observe that the assertion (ii) holds.

(iii) This assertion follows immediately from (ii). □

Theorem 6.4 The equilibrium point $e_{2\lambda}$ with $0 < \lambda < a_1$ is unstable.

Proof Consider the function $h : (-\infty, a_1) \cup (a_3, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by:

$$h(\sigma) = H(e_{2\sigma}).$$

Using the relation (30) for H , we find:

$$h(\sigma) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left[\frac{a^2}{a_1(\sigma - a_1)^2} + \frac{b^2}{a_2(\sigma - a_2)^2} + \frac{c^2}{a_3(\sigma - a_3)^2} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{a^2}{a_1} + \frac{b^2}{a_2} + \frac{c^2}{a_3} \right)$$

The function h have the following properties:

- 0 is an absolute minimum point.
- $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow -\infty} h(\sigma) = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} h(\sigma) = 0$.
- $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow a_1} h(\sigma) = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow a_3} h(\sigma) = \infty$.
- h is strictly decreasing on $(-\infty, 0)$, strictly increasing on $(0, a_1)$ and strictly decreasing on (a_3, ∞) .

The demonstrations divided on three cases.

(I) Assume that $h(\lambda) < 0$. In this situation there exists $\sigma < 0 < \lambda < a_1$ such that $h(\lambda) = h(\sigma)$ and imply $H(e_{2\lambda}) = H(e_{2\sigma})$. Hence the equilibrium points $e_{2\lambda}$ and $e_{2\sigma}$ belong to same ellipsoid.

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.1 (ii), follows $|e_{2\sigma}| < |e_{2\lambda}|$. Applying now Theorem 6.3, deduce that $e_{2\lambda}$ is an unstable equilibrium point.

(II) Assume that $h(\lambda) = 0$ we have $H(e_{2\lambda}) = H(0, 0, 0)$ and it is clearly that $|(0, 0, 0)| < |e_{2\lambda}|$. By Theorem 6.3 we find the desired result.

(III) Assume that $h(\lambda) > 0$. Then there exists $\sigma > a_3$ such that $h(\lambda) = h(\sigma)$ and hence $H(e_{2\lambda}) = H(e_{2\sigma})$. Applying Lemma 6.1 (iii) follows $|e_{2\lambda}| > |e_{2\sigma}|$ and by Theorem 6.3 we deduce that $e_{2\lambda}$ is unstable. $\square$

The stability of equilibrium points of the form e_2 with $\lambda < 0$.

Theorem 6.5 The equilibrium points of the form e_2 with $\lambda < 0$ are Lyapunov stables.

Proof Let $\lambda < 0$ and the equilibrium point $\mathbf{x}_0 = (\frac{a}{\lambda - a_1}, \frac{b}{\lambda - a_2}, \frac{c}{\lambda - a_3})$ of the form e_2 . It is well-known that the study of stability of $\mathbf{x}_0$ in the Lyapunov sense is equivalent with the study of stability of the null solution $(0, 0, 0)$ for the differential system obtained from the ε -revised system by transformation of variables:

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0$$

The system obtained in this manner is called the **perturbed ε -revised system**.

Consider the function $K : \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$K(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{I}^{-1} \mathbf{z} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{z}^2$$

Since the tensor $\mathbf{I}^{-1}$ is strictly positive definite and $\lambda < 0$ we obtain that K is a quadratic form strictly positive definite.

Next we prove that if $\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ is a solution for the perturbed ε -revised system, then:

$$\frac{d}{dt} K(\mathbf{z}(t)) < 0$$

By a direct computation and taking account into the relations (27) we have:

$$K(\mathbf{z}) = H(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda C(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_0 \cdot \mathbf{I}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}_0 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \mathbf{x}_0^2$$

Applying now Theorem 4.2, we obtain:

$$\frac{d}{dt} K(\mathbf{z}(t)) = \varepsilon \lambda (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{x}))^2$$

and follows that $\frac{d}{dt} K(\mathbf{z}(t)) < 0$, since $\varepsilon > 0$, $\lambda < 0$.

It is easy to see that $K^*(t) = K(\mathbf{z}(t))$ is a strictly decreasing function. By theorem 1.1, p.21 in the paper [4] we deduce that $\mathbf{x}_0$ is Lyapunov stable. $\square$

Conclusion - the stability problem for the Hamilton Poisson system (12) versus the ε - revised system (20) with $\varepsilon > 0$

Concerning to the equilibrium points of the system (12) are established the following results (see, theorem 1.1, [12]):

- (1) e_1 is Lyapunov stable;
- (2) e_2 are Lyapunov stables for $\lambda \in (-\infty, a_1) \cup (a_3, \infty)$;
- (3) e_3 are Lyapunov stables;
- (4) e_4 are unstables;
- (5) e_5 are Lyapunov stables.

By Remark 4.1 (see, [12]), there exist cases for which the problem to decide the nonlinear stability or unstability are not discussed.

For the stability of equilibrium points of the ε - revised system (20) with $\varepsilon > 0$ have proved the following assertions:

- (1) e_1 is Lyapunov stable;
- (2) the equilibrium points of the form e_2 with $\lambda \leq 0$ are Lyapunov stables;
- (3) the equilibrium points of the form e_2 with $0 < \lambda < a_1$ are unstables.

References

- [1]. **R. Abraham, J.E. Marsden**, *Foundations of Mechanics. Second Edition*. Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- [2]. **D. Fish**, *Dissipative perturbation of 3D Hamiltonian systems. Metriplectic systems*. Preprint, arXiv:math-ph/0506047, v1, 2005.
- [3]. **J. Guckenheimer, P. Holmes**, *Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems and bifurcations of vector fields*. Springer- Verlag, New York, 1990.
- [4]. **A. Halanay**, *Teoria calitativă a ecuațiilor diferențiale*. Ed. Academiei, București, 1963.
- [5]. **Gh. Ivan, D. Oprea**, *Dynamical systems on Leibniz algebroids*. Differential Geometry - Dynamical Systems, **8**(2006), 127 - 137.
- [6]. **St. Mirică**, *Ecuații diferențiale și cu derivate parțiale I*. Litografia Univ. București, 1989.
- [7]. **J.E. Marsden**, *Lectures on Mechanics*. London Mathematical Society, Lectures Note Series, vol. **174**, 2 nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [8]. **P.J. Morrison**, *A paradigm for joined Hamiltonian and dissipative systems*. Physica, **18D** (1986), 410 - 419.
- [9]. **J.- P. Ortega, V. Planas -Bielsa**, *Dynamics on Leibniz manifolds*. Preprint, arXiv:math. DS/0309263, 2003.
- [10]. **L. Perko**, *Differential equations and dynamical systems*. Springer- Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [11]. **M. Puta**, *Hamiltonian mechanics and geometric quantization*. Mathematics and its Applications, vol. **260**, Kluwer, 1993.
- [12]. **M. Puta, D. Comănescu**, *On the rigid body with three linear controls*. Analele Univ. din Timișoara, Seria Matematică - Informatică, vol. **35** (1), 1997, p.-.
- [13]. **M. Puta, D. Comănescu, S. Chirici**, *Elemente de mecanică hamiltoniană*. Ed. Mirton, Timișoara, 2004.

Seminarul de Geometrie și Topologie
 West University of Timișoara
 Bd-ul V. Pârvan no.4, 300223, Timișoara
 Romania
 E-mail: comanescu@math.uvt.ro, ivan@math.uvt.ro and mihai31ro@yahoo.com